

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

RICK OLMSTEAD,

Plaintiff,

and

**SECRETARY OF THE NAVY, RAY
MABUS,**

Defendant.

No. 13-CV-05051

**PLAINTIFF'S AMENDED
COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES**

Plaintiff, Rick Olmstead, through his attorneys alleges as follows:

I. PARTIES

1.1. Plaintiff, Rick Olmstead, resides in the State of Washington, and is an employee of Puget Sound Naval Shipyard in Bremerton, Kitsap County, Washington.

1.2 Defendant Ray Mabus is the Secretary of the Navy and is the proper defendant in this action.

II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

2.1 All acts and omissions alleged herein occurred in Kitsap County, Washington. The U.S. District Court of Western Washington has jurisdiction over Plaintiff Rick Olmstead's

III. FACTS

1 Supervisor II Vacancy ID: 591330 but was denied the position.

2 3.12 On April 6, 2012, Plaintiff applied to become a Pipefitter Supervisor II but was
3 denied the position.

4 3.13 On April 28, 2012, Plaintiff applied to become a Pipefitter Supervisor II but was
5 denied the position.

6 3.14 On June 11, 2012, Plaintiff applied to become a Pipefitter Lead and was denied
7 the position.

8 3.15 On July 19, 2013, Plaintiff applied to become a Pipefitter Supervisor II and was
9 denied the position.

10 3.16 On July 22, 2013, Plaintiff applied to become a Combined Trades Supervisor II
11 and was denied the position.

12 3.17 On July 24, 2013, Plaintiff applied to become a Pipefitter Supervisor I and was
13 denied the position.

14 3.18 On September 10, 2013, Plaintiff applied to become a Training Instructor and
15 was denied the position.

16 3.19 On October 24, 2013, Plaintiff applied to become a Pipefitter Supervisor I and
17 was denied the position.

18 3.20 On November 5, 2013, Plaintiff applied to become a Pipefitter Leader and was
19 denied the position.

20 3.21 On November 8, 2013, Plaintiff applied for a permanent promotion to Pipefitter
21 Supervisor II. He was not awarded the promotion and later discovered that the two individuals
22 promoted were less than 40 years of age and had been part of the Apprentice program.

23 3.22 Finally, on December 10, 2013, I applied to become a Combined Trades
24 Supervisor II I and was denied the position.

25 3.23 Plaintiff is qualified to receive a promotion to a supervisory position, and he has

1 veteran's preference for the promotion.

2 3.24 Despite Plaintiff's years of experience, impeccable employee record and
3 dedication to the job, he continues to be denied these promotions and receives only temporary
4 Supervisory positions which must be renewed at the end of each project. The result is that a
5 disproportionate number of younger applicants are promoted over older applicants with similar
6 qualifications and more experience.

7 3.25 In fact, many people promoted over Plaintiff are people that he trained.

8 3.26 Plaintiff made numerous complaints to his supervisors regarding his lack of
9 promotion, and repeated promotion of others younger than him with less seniority.

10 3.27 In 2006, Rick Rollins told Plaintiff that he was passed over for a promotion
11 because he was "too old," and "didn't fit in with the new way of doing things." At the time the
12 comment was made, Rick Rollins was a Senior General Foreman who had influence over who
13 was promoted to the exact vacancies Plaintiff had applied for. Specifically, Rick Rollins was in
14 charge of giving evaluations which were used in determining whether to promote a particular
15 applicant to any given vacancy in Shop 56 and had direct contact with the Shop 56
16 Superintendent regarding who would receive the available promotions.

17 3.28 In 2012, Christopher Gal, told Plaintiff that old people are lazy and don't want
18 to do anything. At the time the comment was made, Christopher Gal was a Zone Manager at
19 NRMD Bangor, Washington. Mr. Gal had direct contact with the Nuclear Director and
20 Superintendent of Shop 56 and could provide comments as to Plaintiff's eligibility for being
21 promoted to the applied vacancies identified above.

22 3.29 In April 2012, Plaintiff attempted to file a Complaint for age discrimination with
23 the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission Office at the Shipyard. Plaintiff met with
24 EEO Counselor Gigi Bryant who would not allow him to file a Complaint. She told him that he
25 did not have a claim and that the office would not investigate his complaint. Instead, she

1 threatened to reprimand Plaintiff for referring to the younger generation of workers as “kids.”

2 3.30 In addition, Ms. Bryant did not contact Plaintiff within 30 days after the meeting
3 to follow up with him, nor did she provide Plaintiff with *any* paperwork about his rights with
4 regard to seeking relief from age discrimination.

5 3.31 Since his attempted filing, Defendant has failed to assign Plaintiff overtime in
6 the amounts he was assigned in years passed. Specifically, Plaintiff has assigned 1/10th of the
7 overtime work since the filing of the present action as compared to years past.

8 3.32 On or about April 11, 2012, and pursuant to the FISC Human Resource Manual
9 Appendix 20D, Age Discrimination Complaints, Plaintiff provided Notice of Intent to Sue to
10 the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, as well as to the EEO Complaints Manager
11 for Fleet and Industrial Supply Center Puget Sound.

12 3.33 On January 31, 2013, provided his Notice of Intent to Sue regarding his claims
13 for Retaliation to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and Counsel for Defendant.

14 3.34 Plaintiff has satisfied all administrative procedures, and can file this Amended
15 Complaint directly in U.S. District Court.

16 **IV. CAUSE OF ACTION I: RETALIATION IN VIOLATION OF WASHINGTON**
17 **LAW AGAINST DISCRIMINATION, RCW 49.60 et seq.**

18 4.1 Plaintiff was engaging in statutorily protected activity, as he was exercising his
19 right to be free from discrimination at his workplace.

20 4.2 Defendant, through itself and its agents, took adverse employment action against
21 Plaintiff when they withheld assignment of overtime hours after learning that Plaintiff was
22 attempting to resolve the discrimination he was subjected to by filing a complaint for relief.

23 4.3 After filing the present action in 2013, Plaintiff was assigned 1/10th of the
24 number of overtime hours that he has received in 2012.

25 4.4 Defendant’s desire for retaliation against Plaintiff is the sole reason for denying

1 him overtime hours that he had been assigned in years past.

2 4.5 Since filing the present action, Plaintiff has not been selected for promotional
3 advancements he has applied for, despite being more experienced than those receiving the
4 promotions.

5 4.6 Since filing the present action, Plaintiff has not been made a permanent
6 Pipefitter Supervisor I, despite having years of experience working as a temporary Pipefitter
7 Supervisor I.

8 4.7 As a proximate result of defendants' wrongful acts plaintiff suffered damages.

9 **V. RELIEF SOUGHT**

10 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment against defendant as follows:

11 1.1 For judgment in such an amount as shall be proven at the time of trial.

12 1.2 For all damages available pursuant to RCW 49.60 et seq.

13 1.3 For an award of attorney fees and costs incurred herein.

14 1.4 For such other and further relief as the court deems just and equitable.

15
16 DATED this 27th day of March, 2013.

17
18 Wong Fleming

19
20 

21 Diana Caley, WSBA No. 23413
22 Attorney for Plaintiff, Rick Olmstead
23
24
25